

1 NATALIE HANLON-LEH (*pro hac vice* application filed)

nhanlon-leh@faegre.com

2 MARY V. SOOTER (*pro hac vice* application filed)

msooter@faegre.com

3 DAVID J.F. GROSS (*pro hac vice* application filed)

dgross@faegre.com

4 TIMOTHY E. GRIMSRUD (*pro hac vice* application filed)

tgrimsrud@faegre.com

5 FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

3200 Wells Fargo Center

6 1700 Lincoln Street

Denver, Colorado 80203

7 Telephone: 303-607-3500

8 Facsimile: 303-607-3600

HEATHER N. MEWES (CSB No. 203690)

hmewes@fenwick.com

9 LAUREN E. WHITTEMORE (CSB No. 255432)

lwhittemore@fenwick.com

10 FENWICK & WEST LLP

11 555 California Street, 12th Floor

San Francisco, California 94104

12 Telephone: 415-875-2300

13 Facsimile: 415-281.1350

Attorneys for Defendants

14 JDS Uniphase Corporation and

15 Agility Communications, Inc.

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 BOOKHAM, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 JDS UNIPHASE CORPORATION, a Delaware
corporation;

23 AGILITY COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a
24 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-10,

25 Defendants.

Case No.: C 08-01275-RMW

**DEFENDANTS JDS UNIPHASE
CORPORATION'S AND AGILITY
COMMUNICATION, INC.'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD
BE RELATED**

[Civil L.R. 3-12(b)]

1 Defendants JDS Uniphase Corporation (“JDSU”) and Agility Communications, Inc.
2 (“Agility”) hereby file this Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related.
3 In particular, Defendants request consideration of whether this case is related to a case filed by
4 JDSU against Cyoptics, Inc. (“Cyoptics”) and Syntune AB (“Syntune”) on July 21, 2008, in the
5 United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Jose Division, styled as *JDS*
6 *Uniphase Corporation v. Syntune AB and Cyoptics, Inc.* Case No. C 08-03498-JL.

7 JDSU contends that the two actions are related under Civil L.R. 3-12(a). First, both actions
8 concern “substantially the same” property and technology as both actions involve the alleged
9 infringement of three U.S. patents owned by JDSU—namely, U.S. Patent Nos. 6,658,035, 6,654,400,
10 and 6,687,278. These patents pertain to tunable lasers with integrated optical amplifiers. Both cases
11 will require in-depth understanding of the structure, function, and manufacture of these assemblies,
12 which include tunable solid state lasers, the components within the lasers, integrated optical
13 amplifiers, and the shape of the waveguide that is common to both the laser and amplifier—all
14 fabricated in a common epitaxial structure.

15 Second, JDSU contends that it is likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication
16 of labor and expense and the possibility of conflicting results if the cases are conducted before
17 different Judges. As mentioned, both cases involve the same three U.S. patents owned by JDSU.
18 Moreover, both cases involve allegations that tunable laser products manufactured or marketed by
19 Bookham, Cyoptics, and Syntune, respectively, infringe claims of the three patents. Accordingly,
20 JDSU contends that it would be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense for these
21 two cases to proceed before two different Judges. Moreover, given that both cases will likely require
22 rulings on common issues, such as the interpretation of the invention claimed in the three patents,
23 there is a likelihood of conflicting results if the two cases proceed before different Judges.

24 Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, JDSU requests that the Court order that this case is
25 related to the case of *JDS Uniphase Corporation v. Syntune AB and Cyoptics, Inc.* within the
26 meaning of Local Rule 3-12.

1
2 Respectfully submitted:

3
4 Dated: July 25, 2008

FENWICK & WEST LLP

5
6 By: /s/ Heather N. Mewes

7
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
JDS UNIPHASE CORPORATION.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27